

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please cancel sheet 3 of the formal patent drawings, as filed with the application and consisting of Fig. 3. Please substitute therefor Replacement Sheet 3 also consisting of Fig. 3, as enclosed. Please also add New Sheet 8 consisting of new Fig. 8, as also enclosed.

REMARKS

Applicants, their principal representatives in Germany, and the undersigned have carefully reviewed the first Office Action of October 4, 2006 in the subject U.S. patent application, together with the prior art cited and relied on by the Examiner in the rejections of the claims. In response, the Substitute Specification, drawings and claims of the subject application, as filed, have been amended. It is believed that the claims now pending in the application are patentable over the prior art references cited and relied on by the Examiner, taken either singly or in combination. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

In the first Office Action of October 4, 2006 in the subject U.S. patent application, the Examiner objected to the drawings, as filed with the application, as having several informalities. It was noted that reference numeral 17 and its associated lead line were shown somewhat incorrectly in Fig. 3. In response, there is submitted herewith a Replacement Sheet in which the location of reference numeral 17 and its associated lead line have been corrected in Fig. 3 to agree with the description in the Substitute Specification and in the other drawing figures. This correction does not constitute any

new matter.

The drawings were objected to as failing to show the arrangement of six dressings arranged side-by-side in the axial direction of the cylinder and the arrangement of two dressings arranged in the circumferential direction of the cylinder, as recited in claims 68 and 69, respectively. In response a New Sheet of drawings which consists of Fig. 8 is being submitted. This new drawing figure is a depiction of the cylinder arrangement which is described in detail at paragraph 018 of the Substitute Specification, and which is recited in claims 68 and 69 of the claims set forth in the Preliminary Amendment, which is part of the application, as filed. The addition of new Fig. 8 of the drawings does not constitute any new matter. Its submission overcomes the Examiner's objection to the drawings in this regard.

The Substitute Specification of the application, as filed, has been carefully reviewed, in accordance with the Examiner's request. Several minor typographical errors have been noted and corrected. The Description of the Drawings section has been amended to add a description of newly submitted Fig. 8. In addition, paragraphs 018 and 032 have been amended to recite the existence of Fig. 8. It is believed that these changes do not constitute any new matter.

Claims 68 and 69 were objected to as being improper dependent claims. In response, both of these claims have been cancelled. New claim 78 is essentially prior claim 61 written in independent form and claiming the combination of a device for changing a dressing on a cylinder, and the cylinder. It is believed that newly presented claim 78 is in proper form. Claim 68 has been cancelled. It now is dependent claim 79. Cancelled claim 69 has been rewritten as dependent claim 80. It is believed that the presentation of new independent claim 78 and the substitution of dependent claims 79 and 80 for objected to dependent claims 68 and 69 overcomes the Examiner's objection to these claims.

Claims 66, 72 and 73 were objected to as having several language informalities. The term "roll" has been cancelled. The term "roller element" has been substituted therefor. The Substitute Specification has been revised to change the term "roll" to "roller element." It is believed that this change, and the changes made to the language of the objected to claims, overcomes the Examiner's objection. Claim 73 has been revised to overcome the Examiner's objections. The language changes suggested by the Examiner are appreciated.

Claims 61-73 were rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S.

patent application No. 2004/0244615 to Herbert. The Examiner asserted that the applicants cannot rely on the foreign priority papers filed in the subject application to overcome this rejection because a translation of those papers had not been made of record, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55.

In response, there is concurrently being submitted a verified translation of the German language text of German Application No. DE 102 38 177.1 filed August 21, 2002. There is also enclosed a German language copy of that document. The submission of that verified translation is believed to be sufficient, under 37 CFR 1.55(3)(ii) to allow applicants to rely on the August 21, 2002 filing date of the German priority application. The primary reference to Herbert, U.S. patent application No. 2004/0244615 corresponds to a PCT application filed on September 30, 2002, which filing date is itself after the filing date of the German priority application. However, in accordance with 35 USC 102(e), since the PCT application was published in German, not English, the earliest date available for the Herbert document is the August 17, 2003 publication date of the PCT application, as WO 03/031179. That publication date is clearly after the German priority date of August 21, 2002 of the subject U.S. patent application. Accordingly, claims 61-73 are not anticipated by Herbert 2004/0244615.

Claims 70-72 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent No. 4,727,807 to Suzuki. It was asserted that Suzuki teaches a method for pressing a dressing P on a cylinder A including first and second pressing elements, locating the first and second pressing elements spaced from each other in the circumferential direction of the cylinder, providing at least one dressing suspension leg receiving opening in the cylinder, inserting the leading leg in the opening, rotating the cylinder and using the second pressing element for pressing the trailing leg into the opening. The Examiner invited particular attention to Figs. 8(A)-8(G) of Suzuki and specifically to the marked-up copy of Fig. 8(F) of Suzuki which was incorporated into the Office Action.

In the Suzuki document, U.S. patent No. 4,727, 807, there is shown an apparatus that is usable for automatically mounting and removing printing plates in rotary printing presses. A sequence of the operative steps of this prior art device is depicted in Figs. 8(A) to (G). As may be seen there, a plate P is engaged by suction grippers on the mechanical hand, generally at 1. The plate P is transported to the cylinder A by the mechanical hand 10 which holds the plate P while the leading end P1 is placed in groove a1 of the cylinder A. This is shown in Figs. 8(C) and 8(D). Once this

placement has been accomplished, the suction grippers are disengaged, the cylinder is rotated, and the rollers of the mechanical hand 1 press the plate P against the cylinder. It is important to note that the mechanical hand 1 of the Suzuki reference is in contact with the plate P from the time the plate is picked up from a source of supply, until the plate has been installed on the cylinder.

Claim 70 of the subject application has been amended to clarify that the pressing elements are initially positioned adjacent the surface of the cylinder, that the leading one of the dressing suspension legs is inserted into the opening in the channel, and that the at least one first pressing element and the at least one second pressing element are pressed against the dressing after the dressing leading end suspension leg has been inserted into the opening. This is quite different from Suzuki which shows a device and a process wherein the dressing engaging rollers 12 and 15 are in engagement with the plate P prior to the plate approaching the cylinder, during insertion of the plate leading end into the cylinder opening, and during placement of the plate in the cylinder. The device of Suzuki must have a complex structure to allow it to perform both plate conveyance and mounting functions. In addition, the plate conveyance aspect of the Suzuki device is dedicated to a particular cylinder pair. As seen in Fig. 1,

the entire assembly is supported on a fixed pedestal. Such an arrangement requires a large capital expenditure and has virtually no flexibility.

In the method as recited in currently amended claim 70, the first and second pressing elements are maintained adjacent the surface of the cylinder until such time as the dressing leading end suspension leg has been inserted into the cylinder opening. After such leg insertion has been accomplished, the at least one first pressing element and the at least one second pressing element are together pressed against the plate. The method for pressing the plate or dressing against the cylinder, in accordance with claim 70, as filed, and even more clearly as amended, does not require that the pressing element also function as a plate transportation element. In the present invention, the plate is transported to the cylinder by any suitable means, not by the first and second pressing elements. Accordingly, claim 70, as filed, and even more clearly as amended, or rendered obvious by the prior art Suzuki reference.

Claims 71 and 72 depend from believed allowable, currently amended claim 70. They are also believed to be allowable. Newly added dependent claims 74-77 also depend from believed allowable, currently amended claim 70 and are also believed to be allowable.

The prior art cited by the Examiner in the Office Action of October 4, 2006, but not relied on in the rejection of the claims has been noted. Since it was not applied in the rejection of the claims, no further discussion thereof is believed to be required.


SUMMARY

The Substitute Specification, drawings and claims of the subject U.S. patent application, as filed, have been amended. A verified English language text of the German language priority document is being submitted concurrently. It is believed that the claims now pending in the subject U.S. patent application are allowable over the prior art cited and relied on. Allowance of the claims, and passage of the application to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Kurt Johannes WESCHENFELDER et al.
Applicant

JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant



Douglas R. Hanscom
Reg. No. 26, 600

January 3, 2006
JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.
P.O. Box 2266 Eads Station
Arlington, Virginia 22202
(703) 415-1500
Attorney Docket: W1.1882 PCT-US